

This section analyzes and evaluates the potential impacts of the project on known and currently unknown cultural resources (also known as heritage resources). Cultural resources include districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects generally older than 50 years and considered to be important to a culture, subculture, or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons. For purposes of this analysis, cultural resources are divided into three broad categories: archaeological resources, historical resources, and resources of special concern to Native Americans.

Archaeological resources are locations where human activity has measurably altered the earth or left deposits of prehistoric or historic-era physical remains (e.g., stone tools, bottles, former roads, house foundations). Historical (or architectural) resources include standing buildings (e.g., houses, barns, outbuildings, cabins) and intact structures (e.g., dams, bridges). Traditional or ethnographic cultural resources may include Native American sacred sites (traditional cultural properties), traditional cultural places, and traditional resources of any ethnic community that are important for maintaining the cultural traditions of any group.

The primary source of information for the evaluation in this section is the Cultural Resource Assessment of the Palisades and Squaw Project Area prepared by Peak & Associates (2015).

4.4.1 EXISTING SETTING

PREHISTORY

Archaeological studies in 1953 delineated two prehistoric cultural expressions in the region: the Martis Complex and the Kings Beach Complex. The Martis Complex was defined on the basis of surface remains discovered at a site located in the Martis Valley, south of Truckee. Research suggested the Martis Culture existed from 4,000 to 2,000 years before present (BP), and the Martis Complex peoples were believed to be primarily interested in the exploitation of floral and faunal resources. In subsequent research, the widespread distribution of the Martis Complex was thought to be the result of a relatively homogeneous local culture and probably represented a seasonal adaptation to an economy based on the hunting of large mammals. Evidence suggested the widespread distribution and the essential unity of the Martis Complex over a large area.

Following the Martis Complex in time was the Kings Beach Complex. The Kings Beach Complex peoples were believed to be primarily interested in the exploitation of fish resources, with a secondary emphasis on hunting. The Kings Beach Complex is believed to have existed between AD 1000 to the time of historic contact and the ethnographic culture of the Washoe Indians.

ETHNOLOGY

The Lake Tahoe region was part of the nuclear territory of the Washoe Indians prior to and at the time of Euro-American entry into the area. The Washoe territory extended from the crest of the Sierra on the west to the Virginia and Pine Nut mountains east of Reno. Honey Lake on the north and Antelope Valley on the south appear to have formed the other boundary lines. The Washoe were divided into broad, regionally distinctive groups: the northerners, the easterners, and the southerners. Although the Washoe intensively occupied some 2,000 square miles and altogether used 4,000 square miles, it is estimated that their maximum population did not exceed 1,500. Until the 1820s, the Washoe followed a nomadic life pattern.

The rugged nature of Washoe territory included three major life zones: the boreal zone around Lake Tahoe and at elevations from 6,000 to 10,000 feet in the Sierra, the Jeffrey pine zone below this, and the sagebrush zone of the eastern desert and lower foothills. This variety of

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

environmental zones allowed the Washoe to use a wide variety of natural food resources. Some Washoe crossed the Sierra crest to exploit the acorns that were plentiful on the west slope. To efficiently exploit the wide variety of resources that were available but spread over a large territory, the Washoe employed a subsistence strategy called the “seasonal round.” Over the calendar year, the population moved from area to area as certain food sources became most readily available. The group that camped on the north side of Lake Tahoe gathered piñon nuts in the hills west of Reno, while the southern group gathered them in the hills south and east of Minden and Gardnerville.

HISTORIC SETTING

The project area is located along Squaw Creek near its junction with the Truckee River approximately 4 miles northwest of Tahoe City. Tahoe City was reportedly surveyed and established by William Pomin from Forest Hill in the fall of 1863. A 100-foot-long wharf was completed the following summer. An 1867 description of Tahoe City called the area the sailor’s nook of the lake, with a dozen small craft at anchor near the wharf. At the river’s outlet, several pleasure yachts were moored, owned by San Francisco and Virginia City residents with summer villas at the lake. A ferry ran between Tahoe City and Glenbrook. In the early years, lumbering became the predominant industry of the area, with log chutes and flumes in the region as well as logging camps. Logs were gathered on the lake and rafted to Glenbrook for milling. After the decline of logging, year-round tourism became the primary support industry in the region.

Squaw Valley, or Olympic Valley as it was known post-1960, was the site of the 1960 Winter Olympics. The ski resort at Squaw Valley opened in 1949 thanks to the efforts of Wayne Poulsen and Alex Cushing. Cushing was instrumental in securing the site for the 1960 Olympic Games.

CURRENT CONDITIONS

The project site is presently undeveloped, containing no structures. The two parcels that constitute the site are separated by a paved roadway identified as Creeks End Court, which provides access to the existing residences north of the site (The Estates at Squaw Creek). Adjacent locations contain a mix of residential and nonresidential development. None of the buildings or structures adjoining the site are considered historic. Squaw Valley is California Historic Landmark Number 724, which is commemorative of the Olympics at Squaw Valley in 1960 and for being an early ski area in California.

RECORDS SEARCH AND PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

A records search for the project site was conducted through the North Central Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) on September 1, 2015. Four prehistoric period resources were identified within the project site: CA-PLA-163, CA-PLA-165, CA-PLA-957, and CA-PLA-960. Portions of the project site were previously surveyed in 1975, 1991, and 2006. Some survey work on the project area was performed in 1998, but no report or site forms were filed with the NCIC. Major data recovery excavations have been conducted at a number of sites in the project area and local vicinity in 2006; however, no new site forms were filed for the sites excavated.

Two of the sites listed in the NCIC records search were recorded in 1975: CA-PLA-163 and CA-PLA-165. A large archeological excavation occurred on the property immediately to the west of this project area in the 1970s, with a major report on findings in 1977. Two other sites, CA-PLA-657 and CA-PLA-960, were recorded in 1999.

In 1999, Susan Lindstrom completed a survey of the 44-acre tract that appears to include the property to the northeast and the subject property of 19.9 acres. Lindstrom reportedly updated the site forms for CA-PLA-163 and CA-PLA-165. In 1999, Lindstrom conducted major excavations on a number of prehistoric sites in the area, including CA-PLA-163, CA-PLA-165, CA-PLA-657, and CA-PLA-960. A report for these excavations was issued in 2006, but no site forms reporting the results of the excavations were prepared and filed with the NCIC.

INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION OF PROJECT SITE RESOURCES

The project area was inspected by means of an intensive pedestrian walk-over with transects spaced at an average of 10 meters in width on September 14, 2015, by Peak & Associates. The area contained a mixed coniferous forest and a number of small dirt roads and was generally open with good to moderate surface visibility. Peak & Associates also visited the project site on October 6, 2015, to re-examine resources.

Prehistoric-Period Sites

CA-PLA-163 (Location in the Project Area)

CA-PLA-163 is shown on the property in 1975 and reported to be a diffuse scatter of basalt flakes, but Lindstrom found nothing in the reported re-survey of the property. Lindstrom believed there was a different location for the site to the north and east of the location as compared to that shown on the NCIC maps for the site. Lindstrom undertook major data recovery at a site called CA-PLA-163 in 1999 and completed a report for this site in 2006. No trace of this site remains; many homes and roadways have been constructed in the area.

At the location reported in 1975 to be CA-PLA-163, although Lindstrom found nothing, Peak & Associates found a small scatter of surface artifacts, all basalt flakes. Small holes were excavated in the site area by hand; there was no trace of a subsurface deposit. Peak & Associates concluded the surface scatter cannot provide information important in prehistory.

Peak & Associates believe the original recorded location is valid, however, and will contact the NCIC to file an update. They anticipate a new number will likely be applied to this location.

CA-PLA-163 (Location East of Project Area)

The Lindstrom report provided a location northeast of the current project area for the proposed project. This site is considered eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) because it was the subject a major data recovery excavations in 1999, and the excavation provided important information in prehistory. However, this site is in an adjacent neighborhood and would not be a concern for the proposed project.

CA-PLA-165

The site is considered CRHR-eligible because it was the subject of major data recovery excavations in 1999, and the excavation provided information important in prehistory. No further fieldwork is necessary because data recovery has been conducted.

CA-PLA-957

An unrecorded bedrock mortar station not seen by the archaeologists who conducted previous data recovery at the site was discovered, along with some historic-period debris from dumping.

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The site is CRHR-eligible because it was the subject of a major data recovery effort in 1999. However, no additional work, other than updating the site form (which will be completed by Peak & Associates), is necessary because the data recovery has been completed.

CA-PLA-960

No trace of CA-PLA-960 was found in the field in the 2015 survey. Peak & Associates suggested that the site may have been destroyed during the construction of Creeks End Court. Data recovery at the site was reported to have been completed in 1999, and no further efforts are required for this site.

Lindstrom recommended that monitoring be undertaken during construction on these sites and several others that were excavated. Peak & Associates reported that no monitoring reports had been filed at the NCIC for all work on the property, so it is not known if these recommendations are conditions of the development, but it is recommended that monitoring should be implemented for the proposed project.

Historic-Period Site

PA-15-90

In addition to the original scatter of CA-PLA-163, portions of CA-PLA-165, and CA-PLA-657, another site was found within the property and recorded by Peak & Associates. This site, PA-15-90, contains historic-period artifacts and appears to be a recent dump, containing artifacts from about 1950 to the present. Several small holes were excavated by hand in the site area, and there was no deposit associated with the artifacts. Peak & Associates were of the opinion this seemed to be a recent single-incident dump.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conducted a review of its Sacred Lands files on August 24, 2015. No Sacred Lands were identified by the NAHC in or near the project area. The NAHC also provided a list of Native American individuals and organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Letters and a map with the project area of potential environmental effect (APE) were sent on September 1, 2015, to Gene Whitehouse, Chairperson, United Auburn Community of Auburn Rancheria; Jason Camp, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, United Auburn Community of Auburn Rancheria; Marcos Guerrero, Tribal Preservation Committee, United Auburn Community of Auburn Rancheria; Don Ryberg, Chairperson, Tsi Akim Maidu; Eileen Moon, Vice Chairperson, Tsi Akim Maidu; Grayson Coney, Cultural Director, Tsi Akim Maidu; Judith Marks, Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe; Pamela Cubbler, Colfax-Todds Valley Consolidated Tribe; Nicholas Fonseca, Chairperson, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians; Hermo Olanio, Vice Chairperson, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians; Daniel Fonseca, Cultural Resource Director, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians; April Wallace Moore; and Rose Enos. Letters were also sent on September 1, 2015, to Darrell Kizer, Chairperson, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California; and Darrel Cruz, Cultural Resources Department, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California THPO, who were not on the NAHC-provided list.

Daniel Fonseca, Cultural Resource Director, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, replied on September 10, 2015, indicating that the Shingle Springs Band was unaware of any cultural resources at the site and asked to be kept informed of project changes, including the discovery of new information or human remains. As of the date of publication of this Draft EIR, the County has received no other responses.

4.4.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

FEDERAL

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 established guidelines to “preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and to maintain, wherever possible, an environment that supports diversity and a variety of individual choice.” One of the provisions of NHPA was the development of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP, or National Register), which is administered by the National Park Service. The National Register Bulletin also provides guidance in the evaluation of archaeological site significance.

American Indian Religious Freedom Act and Native American Graves and Repatriation Act

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act recognizes that Native American religious practices, sacred sites, and sacred objects have not been properly protected under other statutes. It establishes as national policy that traditional practices and beliefs, sites (including right of access), and the use of sacred objects are to be protected and preserved. Additionally, Native American remains are protected by the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act of 1990.

STATE

California Register of Historical Resources

California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 4852 addresses the types of historical resources and criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. The criteria for listing historical resources in the CRHR are consistent with those developed by the National Park Service for listing historical resources in the NRHP, but have been modified for state use to include a range of historical resources that better reflect the history of California. Only resources that meet the criteria may be listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the CRHR.

California Health and Safety Code, Sections 7050.5 and 7052

Section 7052 of the Health and Safety Code states that the disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony. Section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC.

California Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act

The California Native American Historical, Cultural and Sacred Sites Act applies to both state and private lands. The act requires that upon discovery of human remains, construction or excavation activity cease and the county coroner be notified. If the remains are of a Native American, the coroner must notify the NAHC. The NAHC then notifies the most likely descendants. The act stipulates the procedures the descendants may follow for treating or disposing of the remains and associated grave goods.

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Public Resources Code, Section 5097

California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097 specifies the procedures to be followed in the event of the unexpected discovery of human remains on nonfederal land. The disposition of Native American burial falls within the jurisdiction of the NAHC. Section 5097.5 of the PRC states the following:

No person shall knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure, or deface any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands. Violation of this section is a misdemeanor.

California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) offers guidelines regarding impacts on historic and prehistoric cultural resources. The State CEQA Guidelines define a significant historical resource as "a resource listed or eligible for listing on the CRHR" (PRC Section 5024.1). Per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(a)(3), a historical resource may be eligible for listing on the CRHR if it:

- 1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage; or
- 2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; or
- 3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic values; or
- 4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The State CEQA Guidelines also require the consideration of unique archaeological sites (Section 15064.5[c]). As outlined in PRC Section 21083.2, a "unique archaeological resource" is an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- 1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- 2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- 3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria for inclusion in the CRHR but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource as outlined in PRC Section 21083.2, it may be treated as a significant historical resource. Treatment options under PRC Section 21083.2 include activities that preserve such resources in place in an undisturbed state. Other acceptable

methods of mitigation under PRC Section 21083.2 include excavation and curation or study in place without excavation and curation (if the study finds that the significant historical resource would not meet one or more criteria for defining a unique archaeological resource).

Assembly Bill 52

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes as part of CEQA and equates significant impacts on "tribal cultural resources" with significant environmental impacts (PRC Section 21084.2). AB 52 defines a California Native American tribe as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC. AB 52 requires formal consultation with California Native American tribes prior to determining the level of environmental document if a tribe has requested to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects. AB 52 also requires that consultation address project alternatives, include mitigation measures for significant effects, if requested by the California Native American tribe, and that consultation be considered concluded when either the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, or the agency concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. Under AB 52, such measures are to be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and adopted mitigation monitoring program if determined to avoid or lessen a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource.

LOCAL

Placer County General Plan

General Plan policies applicable to the proposed project are listed below.

- Policy 1.I.1.** The County shall require that significant natural, open space, and cultural resources be identified in advance of development and incorporated into site-specific development project design. The Planned Residential Developments (PDs) and the Commercial Planned Development (CPD) provisions of the Zoning Ordinance can be used to allow flexibility for this integration with valuable site features.
- Policy 1.D.10.** The County shall encourage the preservation of historic and attractive buildings in existing downtowns/village centers, and encourage new development to enhance the character of downtowns/village centers.
- Policy 5.D.6.** The County shall require that discretionary development projects identify and protect from damage, destruction, and abuse, important historical, archaeological, paleontological, and cultural sites and their contributing environment. Such assessments shall be incorporated into a countywide cultural resource data base, to be maintained by the Department of Museums.
- Policy 5.D.7.** The County shall require that discretionary development projects are designed to avoid potential impacts to significant paleontological or cultural resources whenever possible. Unavoidable impacts, whenever possible, shall be reduced to a less than significant level and/or shall be mitigated by extracting maximum recoverable data. Determinations of impacts, significance, and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeological (in consultation with recognized local Native American groups), historical, or paleontological consultants, depending on the type of resource in question.

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance

The Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (Placer County 1983) does not include any policies related to cultural resources.

4.4.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on the Placer County CEQA checklist and Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would result in a significant impact on cultural resources if it would:

- 1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
- 2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.
- 3) Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values.
- 4) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area.
- 5) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

METHODOLOGY

The following impact analysis is based on the Cultural Resource Assessment of the Palisades and Squaw Project Area prepared by Peak & Associates (2015). The study consisted of a records search and evaluation, field investigation, and Native American consultation, as described in the Existing Setting subsection above.

PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Historic, Prehistoric, and Archaeological Resources (Standards of Significance 1, 2, 3, and 4)

Impact 4.4.1 Construction of the proposed project has the potential to encounter previously unknown subsurface historic, prehistoric, or archaeological resources. This is a **potentially significant** impact.

Based on the cultural resources assessment for the proposed project, there are no known historic, prehistoric, or archeological resources on the site. However, the project site does include recorded resource locations with data recovery, and there is the potential the project could result in the damage or destruction of a known or as yet undiscovered archaeological resource. If such resources were present, any substantial change to or destruction of these resources representing historical resources or unique archaeological resources as defined by CEQA would be a **potentially significant** impact. The cultural resources assessment for the project recommended that an archaeological monitor be present during the initial excavation work at the site to evaluate any find and implement appropriate actions if resources are found.

Mitigation Measures

MM 4.4.1 **Monitoring During Construction Activities and Mitigation for Discovered Archaeological Resources.** A professional archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in Archaeology shall be present at the project site, at the applicant's expense, during initial ground disturbance to monitor for the presence of subsurface resources. If ground disturbance occurs over phases, the archaeologist shall be present during each phase.

In the event that evidence of any prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities (e.g., ceramic shards, trash scatters, lithic scatters), the archaeologist shall ensure all ground-disturbing activity in the area of the discovery is halted until the significance of the find is determined. The Placer County Planning Services Division and the Department of Museums shall be notified of the potential find. If an archeological site, the appropriate Native American group shall be notified. If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the California Register of Historical Resources standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the Planning Services Division shall be notified and a data recovery plan shall be prepared. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find is determined to constitute either a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist shall work with the project applicant to avoid disturbance to the resources, and if complete avoidance is not possible, follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard DPR Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the appropriate California Historical Resources Information System office for the project area (the North Central Information Center). Project Improvement Plans will include this measure as a note in the plans.

Implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.4.1** would reduce potentially significant impacts on as-yet currently undiscovered archaeological resources because actions would be taken to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid disturbance, disruption, or destruction of archaeological resources, this impact would be reduced to **less than significant** and would ensure consistency with General Plan Policies 5.D.6 and 5.D.7.

Human Remains (Standard of Significance 5)

Impact 4.4.2 Construction of the proposed project could inadvertently result in disturbance of human remains. This is a **potentially significant** impact.

Based on documentary research, no evidence suggests that any prehistoric or historic-era marked or unmarked human interments are present within or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. However, there is the potential human remains could be discovered during construction. This is a **potentially significant** impact.

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

California law recognizes the need to protect Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are included in California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5 and 7052 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.

Mitigation Measures

MM 4.4.2 **Protection and Treatment of Discovered Human Remains.** If human remains are discovered during any construction activities, potentially damaging ground-disturbing activities in the area of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the project applicant shall notify the Placer County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission immediately, according to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the remains are determined by the NAHC to be Native American, the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The project applicant shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience to conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the most likely descendant (MLD), if any, identified by the NAHC. Following the coroner's and the NAHC's findings, the archaeologist and the NAHC-designated most likely descendant shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional human interments are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in California Public Resources Code Section 5097.94. Project Improvement Plans will include this measure as a note in the plans.

Implementation of mitigation measure **MM 4.4.2** would reduce potentially significant impacts to human remains because actions would be implemented to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the remains appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid or minimize the disturbance of human remains and to appropriately treat any remains that are discovered, this impact would be reduced to a **less than significant** level.

4.4.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative context for historical resources is Squaw Valley, with significant historic resources being associated with the 1960 Winter Olympics in the valley. The cumulative context for archaeological resources and human remains is the Truckee-Tahoe Basin portion of the Washoe territory.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Cumulative Impacts on Cultural Resources

Impact 4.4.3 The proposed project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects, has the potential to further cause a substantial change in the significance of archaeological resources or disturb human remains. This impact is **less than cumulatively considerable**.

Based on previous cultural resource surveys and research, the Truckee-Tahoe Basin was inhabited by prehistoric and historic people for thousands of years. The proposed project, in combination with other development in the basin, could contribute to the loss of significant archaeological resources. Because all significant cultural resources are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base. The loss of any one archaeological site could affect the scientific value of others in a region because these resources are best understood in the context of the entirety of the cultural system of which they are a part. The cultural system is represented archaeologically by the total inventory of all sites and other cultural remains in the region. As a result, a meaningful approach to preserving and managing cultural resources must focus on the likely distribution of cultural resources, rather than on a single project or parcel boundary.

Proper planning and appropriate mitigation can help to capture and preserve knowledge of such resources and can provide opportunities for increasing the understanding of the past environmental conditions and cultures by recording data about sites discovered and preserving artifacts found. Federal, state, and local laws are also in place, as discussed above, that protect these resources in most instances. Even so, it is not always feasible to protect these resources, particularly when preservation in place would make projects infeasible. For this reason, the cumulative effects of past and present projects in the Truckee-Tahoe Basin have had a significant cumulative impact on cultural resources.

There are no other known historic, prehistoric, or archaeological resources on the project site other than those that have been evaluated, recorded, and been the subject of previous data recovery. However, potential previously unknown resources could be discovered during construction. Without mitigation, implementation of the proposed project has the potential to further disturb human remains and cause a substantial change in the significance of archaeological resources that are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes, if such resources are present. Without mitigation, the project's incremental contribution to these cumulative effects would itself be potentially cumulatively considerable; therefore, this is a potentially significant cumulative impact. However, with implementation of mitigation measures **MM 4.4.1** and **MM 4.4.2**, adverse effects on currently known archeological resources and potentially newly discovered archeological resources and human remains would be avoided. With implementation of these measures, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative loss of archaeological resources or human remains; therefore, this would be a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

Mitigation Measures

No additional mitigation measures are necessary.

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

REFERENCES

Peak & Associates. 2015. *Cultural Resource Assessment of the Palisades and Squaw Project Area*.

Placer County. 1983. *Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance*.

———. 2013. *Placer County General Plan*.